

In the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Date: September 11, 2007

In re Application of: Shigeo Azuma

Filed: December 3, 2003

For: Machine Translation of Chat Room Sessions and Other Collaborative Work Using Session-Specific Dictionaries

Serial Number: 10/726,443

Art Unit: 2626

Examiner: Godbold, Douglas

Request for Clarification of Final Office Action

Commissioner of Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

It is respectfully requested that clarification be provided for certain statements contained in a final Office action delivered electronically with a Notification Date of August 28, 2007 and the period for response to the action be re-started as of the date of delivery of the clarifications. No fees should be required for submission of this request. If any such fees are deemed to be payable, those fees should be charged against Deposit Account 09-0461 maintained by International Business Machines Corporation, assignee of all right, title and interest in the invention covered by the subject application.

Page 4 of the final Office action contains the following two statements:

1. "However Nishino does not teach that the session is a collaborative session, nor that the user dictionary isn't deleted when the session ends."
2. "Shimohata teaches that the session is a collaborative session (Abstract describes a conversation system), nor that the user dictionary isn't deleted when the session ends"

It is not clear whether statement 1 should be interpreted as saying that Nishino does not teach that the user directory is deleted when the session ends or, alternatively, as saying that Nishino does teach that the user directory is deleted when the session ends.

Similarly, it is not clear whether statement 2 should be interpreted as saying that Shimohata does not teach that the user directory is deleted when the session ends or, alternatively, as saying that Nishino does teach that the user directory is deleted when the session ends.

It is respectfully requested that statements as to what each of the references does or does not teach be provided without using confusing double negatives.

These statements deal with key points. Until clarifications are provided, preparation of a response to the Office action (other than perhaps an immediate appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences) cannot be begun.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Gerald R. Woods/

Gerald R. Woods, Reg. 24,144
(919) 554-0993